

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 and 14-50 are now present in this application.

Claim 1 has been amended, claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice of disclaimer and claims 14-50 have been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 stands objected to for certain informalities. In view of the foregoing amendments, this objection should now be overcome and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Botos et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0129492 in view of Hunter, US Patent 6,822,407. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 7 and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Botos et al. in view of Nishi et al., U.S. Patent 6,864,955. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Examiner considers claims 8, 9 and 13 to contain allowable subject matter.

The patent to Botos et al. is directed to a multi-axial movable device for fiber coupling. There can be alignment between fibers as well as alignment between a fiber and a small device by using this device. The Botos et al. device comprise a base plate 10, a four axial (X-Y-Z-Theta) mechanically movable device, a tilt state, and a carriage plate connected to the mechanically movable device such that the carriage plate is capable of moving in five axial directions. However, the Botos et al. device fails to disclose or teach the retaining member as recited in the claims of the present invention.

The secondary reference to Hunter shows a system for manipulating a planar substrate. The lift pin recited in Hunter sucks the substrate such that the substrate is kept on the chuck 10 during axial movement (note column 1, lines 13-16; column 10, lines 9-13; column 11, lines 29-37, 50-55, 63-65; column 12, lines 2-6; column 13, lines 54-56; and column 14, lines 25-27.) Hunter is directed at solving the moving problems of substrates during manufacture and is not in the same technical field as that of Botos et al. It is submitted that one skilled in the art would not combine the device of Botos et al. with the teachings of Hunter. The Hunter teachings would not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of the Botos et al disclosure.

Turning to the patent to Nishi, a stage apparatus is disclosed with a movable stage structure body which holds a substrate plate to be processed and is movable on a base structure body. The movable main stage member includes a holder 10 for chip placement. However, Nishi fails to disclose or teach the retaining member as recited in the various claims. The Nishi patent is directed to solving the moving problems of substrates during manufacture and is not in the same technical field as that of Botos et al. The Nishi patent is direct to a substrate moving stage with high precision use for lithography as discussed in column 1, lines 9-20. One skilled in the art would not attempt to combine the Botos et al and Nishi teachings. Moreover, the Nishi patent does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of the Botos et al. disclosures.

The independent claims of the present invention would not be anticipated or rendered obvious by the teachings of Botos et al. Moreover, the secondary references to Hunter and Nishi would not be combined with the Botos et al. device. However, even if, in arguendo, such a combination were made the positioning and measuring stations of the independent claims would

not be obtained. The dependent claims would therefore not be found in the prior art utilized by the Examiner. As such the 35 USC 103 rejections should now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Because the additional prior art cited by the Examiner has been included merely to show the state of the prior art and has not been utilized to reject the claims, no further comments concerning these documents are considered necessary at this time.

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant